



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of: **IDEI, et al.**

Group Art Unit: **1774**

Serial No.: **09/508,617**

Examiner: **L. Ferguson**

Filed: **March 14, 2000**

P.T.O. Confirmation No.: **8477**

For: **PAPER FOR INK JET AND ELECTROPHOTOGRAPHIC RECORDING**

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 CFR §1.111

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

January 12, 2005

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated **July 13, 2004**, which is the fifth Office Action in the prosecution of this application, along with a three (3) Petition for Extension of Time extending the time for response to **January 13, 2005**, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the prior art rejections discussed below:

- ① Claims 1 and 4-5 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over **Fujioka et al.** (previously applied).

(In the statement of the rejection in the first paragraph of ¶ 3 on page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that Claims 1 and 4-5 are rejected over Fujioka in view of Tanaka (U.S. Patent 5,252,184). However, the Examiner then states (line 3 of ¶ 5 on page 4) that “Tanaka is withdrawn” and later, on page 5 states, “Arguments toward the Tanaka reference are moot due to the reference being withdrawn.” Also, Tanaka is not mentioned anywhere in the main rejection of ¶ 3, except the first paragraph as noted above. It appears that the Examiner